REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-8, 10, 11, and 13-18 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 6, 10, and 11, have canceled claims 4, 5, and 9, and have added new claims 14-18. These changes do not introduce any new matter.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 4-11, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Morag* (US 6,324,545 B1) in view of *Shaffer et al.* ("*Shaffer*") (US 6,396,963 B2) (as noted above, claims 4, 5, and 9 have been canceled). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of the *Morag* and *Shaffer* references would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claims 1 and 11, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants have amended independent apparatus claim 1 to include the features specified in original claims 5 and 9. Applicants have amended independent method claim 11 along the same lines that claim 1 has been amended.

In formulating the obviousness rejection, the Examiner asserts that the *Morag* reference discloses the features of original claim 5, which features are now incorporated in independent claims 1 and 11. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's characterization of the *Morag* reference relative to the claimed subject matter.

The *Morag* reference discloses the combining of multiple images to generate an image mosaic, but does not disclose or suggest preparing a template by combining an original template image, which has no image integration area, with at least one area display image, which defines the at least one image integration area. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion of this feature in the *Shaffer* reference.

The preparation of a template by combining an original template image with an area display image has at least two advantageous effects. First, a single original template image

can be combined with many types of area display images, thus allowing for a variety of types

of templates. Second, even an image having no integration area can be made into a template

with an image integration area, by being combined with an area display image. This also

allows for a variety of types of templates.

In view of the foregoing, even if the *Morag* and *Shaffer* references were to be

combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of this combination would not

have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claims 1 and 11.

Therefore, the combination of *Morag* in view of *Shaffer* would not have rendered the subject

matter defined in present claims 1 and 11 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 11, as amended herein, are patentable under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Morag* in view of *Shaffer*. Claims 6-8 and 10,

each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, and claim 13, which depends from claim 11,

are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Morag in view of

Shaffer for at least the same reasons set forth above regarding the applicable independent

claim.

New Claims

As noted above, Applicants have added new claims 14-18. New claims 14-16

correspond to original claims 2, 3, and 12, which were canceled earlier in the prosecution of

the subject application. New claims 17 and 18 specify additional features of the apparatus

defined in claim 1. Support for the subject matter recited in claims 17 and 18 can be found in

Applicants' specification at, for example, page 22, line 11 to page 24, line 10.

Page 7 of 8

Application No. 10/828,878 Amendment dated November 24, 2008 Response to Final Office Action mailed July 22, 2008 (Submitted with RCE)

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1, 6-8, 10, 11, and 13, as amended herein, and examination of new claims 14-18, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 749-6902. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. ITECP015).

Respectfully submitted, MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

Peter B. Martine Reg. No. 32,043

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200 Sunnyvale, California 94085 Customer Number 25920